

REMARKS

Upon entry of the above amendment, claims 1-10 and 16-18 are pending, with claims 1, 16, and 18 being the independent claims. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, and 16-18 are amended. Support for these changes can be found throughout Applicants' originally filed specification, including, *inter alia*, pages 8-18 of the written description and Figures 1A-4, of the drawings. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

Personal Interview with Examiner

A telephone interview was held on Wednesday, September 6, 2006 between Examiner Kambiz Zand and Applicants' representatives Ariel Sakin, Arik Zuckerman, Cindy McGann, Christa Matthews, and Kendrick P. Patterson (Reg. No. 45,321). Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for a helpful and constructive interview.

During the interview, Applicants' representatives presented an overview of the claimed invention and discussed the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicants' representatives presented several distinguishing features between the cited document and the claimed invention. The claims, as amended herein, reflect at least one of these distinguishing features. For example, referring to the Examiner's account of the telephone interview, "Mr. Sakin & Zuckerman described the invention in [a] clear manner, describing that the dynamic creation of every action within a set of action leads to allowance or rejection of the request for access based on criteria created each time where such criteria are not predetermined in advance for comparison to criteria created and any access that are based on." (Paper No. 20050925,

Form PTOL-413). Although Applicants believe the previously presented claims included this feature, the amended claims place greater emphasis on this feature. Reconsideration of the standing rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, claims 1-10 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,289,462 to McNabb *et al.* ("McNabb"). Paper No. 20060925, page 3. Although Applicants respectfully disagree, this rejection is moot in light of the above amendment, which places greater emphasis on the distinctions between McNabb and the pending claims.

With respect to independent claim 1, McNabb does not disclose each and every element, limitation, and/or feature of claim 1, as presently amended. For example, McNabb does not disclose "based on each simulated execution, building or supplementing a list of allowable actions or user-definable inputs to the allowable actions in response to receiving a server message corresponding to the simulated execution" and "where the list of allowable actions or user-definable inputs includes the user-requested actions or inputs, authorizing execution of the user requested actions or inputs, and supplementing the list of allowable actions or user-definable inputs upon receipt of a subsequent server message in response to the authorized execution," as recited in claim 1. Referring to the Examiner's account of the above Telephone Interview (discussed above), each server response (including the transmission of a server message or document) triggers the "dynamic creation of every action within a set of actions," as stipulated by the recited "simulating execution of each set of actions upon receipt of the plurality of server messages." Such simulated executions (or "dynamic creation of every action...")

“leads to an allowance or rejection of a request for access” (referred to in claim 1 by the recited “client messages including one or more user requested actions or inputs”) “based on criteria created each time” (referred to in claim 1 as a “list of allowable actions or user-definable inputs” that is supplemented “upon receipt of a subsequent server message in response to the authorized execution”). Therefore, the criteria (the recited “allowable actions/inputs”) are being created and refined each time the server responds to a request for access.

Independent claims 16 and 18 have similar features as claim 1, and are patentable over McNabb for at least the above reason. Moreover claims 2-9 and 17 depend directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims 1 or 16. Therefore, these dependent claims are patentable over McNabb for at least the reasons stated above, in addition to the particular features recited in the dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the standing rejections, and allowance of the pending claims.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is kindly invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-4270.

Date: March 29, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Kendrick P. Patterson
Reg. No. 45,321

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN
& STEINER LLP
900 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022
Tel : (212) 895-2000
Fax: (212) 895-2900

Customer No. 29858